



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/826,374	04/04/2001	Scott Jeffrey Sherr	041892-0207	2879	
34492	7590 07/08/2005		EXAMINER		
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP (LAIP GROUP) 555 W. FIFTH ST., SUITE 4000			BADII, BE	BADII, BEHRANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGEL	LOS ANGELES, CA 90013		3621	TALER NOMBER	

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

and a					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/826,374	SHERR ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Behrang Badii	3621			
 The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply 	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 Jules</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise. 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 44-58 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 44-58 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 April 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	A □ 1-A	(PTO 412)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/8/02 & 9/16/02. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 44-58 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-43 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR

1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 6/2/05. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP 821.01.

Claims 44 – 58 have been examined.

P = paragraph, e.g. p1 = paragraph 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 44-47 & 51–54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fucarile et al., U.S. patent 6,766,305, and further in view of Salas et al., U.S. patent application publication 2002/0087476.

As per claim 44, Fucarile et al. discloses a business method for controlling distribution of content to a network enabled device, the method comprising:

transferring selected content to the network enabled device, the selected content being supplied by a content owner (abstract);

communicating, over a network, a license to the network enabled device, the license including access level information defining conditions for controlling the network enabled device to produce a user-perceptible form of the selected content when conditions defined by the access level information are met and to inhibit production of a user-perceptible form of the selected content when conditions defined by the access level information are not met (col.2, 54-67); and

charging a license fee to a user of the network enabled device based on a license access level (col.2, 54-67). Fucarile et al. does not disclose a license associated with the selected content. Salas et al. discloses a license associated with the selected content (abstract). It would have been obvious to modify Fucarile et al. to include a license associated with the selected content such as that taught by Salas et al. in order to for the license to be pertinent to the user and the licensor such that the wrong license does not get associated with the wrong content.

As per claim 45, Fucarile et al. further discloses wherein charging the license fee to the user of the network enabled device comprises providing an interface for allowing the user of the network enabled device to select the license access level from a plurality of license access levels, each license access level defining a different set of conditions, wherein the license

Art Unit: 3621

associated with the selected content includes access level information corresponding to the license access level selected by the user (col.2, 54-67).

As per claim 46, Fucarile et al. further discloses wherein the plurality of access levels comprise:

a level defining a time window in which the network enabled device may produce a user-perceptible form of the selected content no more than once; and

a level defining a time window in which the network enabled device may produce a user-perceptible form of the selected content an unlimited number of times (col.2, 54-67).

As per claim 47, Fucarile et al. further discloses paying to the content owner a percentage of the license fee charged for the license associated with the selected content (col.2, 25-43, 54-67; col.4, 17-21; col.5, 33-58).

Claims 48-50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fucarile et al., U.S. patent 6,766,305 as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Anderson et al., U.S. patent application publication 2004/0078490.

As per claims 48-50 and 52, Fucarile et al. discloses a business method as discussed above. Fucarile et al. does not disclose wherein demographic information associated with the license is used to compile a database of licensing information for various regions or wherein the database provides a plurality of parameters for available licenses for the content according to the determined geographical location of the user requesting the content or wherein

Art Unit: 3621

the plurality of parameters comprises at least one of availability of the content at a particular time and availability of the content at a particular geographical location or wherein the geographical location of the user is determined from at least one of the user's credit card information, an IP address of the user's computer system, and geographical information provided by the operating system of the user's computer system. Anderson et al. discloses wherein demographic information associated with the license is used to compile a database for various regions (abstract) or wherein the database provides a plurality of parameters for available content according to the determined geographical location of the user requesting the content (p.198, 208 & 367) or wherein the plurality of parameters comprises at least one of availability of the content at a particular time and availability of the content at a particular geographical location (p542) or wherein the geographical location of the user is determined from at least one of the user's credit card information, an IP address of the user's computer system, and geographical information provided by the operating system of the user's computer system (p45-46). It would have been obvious to modify Fucarile et al. to include wherein demographic information associated with the license is used to compile a database of licensing information for various regions or wherein the database provides a plurality of parameters for available licenses for the content according to the determined geographical location of the user requesting the content or wherein the plurality of parameters comprises at least one of availability of the content at a particular time and availability of the content at a particular geographical location or

Art Unit: 3621

wherein the geographical location of the user is determined from at least one of the user's credit card information, an IP address of the user's computer system, and geographical information provided by the operating system of the user's computer system such as that taught by Anderson et al. in order to place licenses in the database according to location and demographic such that any licensing done in the future can be carried out by research on the licenses already given according to location of the user.

As per claim 51, Fucarile et al. further discloses wherein the licensing information is provided to content owners (col.2, 25-43; fig's. 4 & 11).

As per claim 53, Fucarile et al. further discloses providing benefits to the user under defined circumstances (paying for each time used as opposed to paying a set fee, i.e. the user can pay less) (col.2, 54-67).

As per claim 54, Fucarile et al. further discloses wherein the benefits comprise charging a reduced license fee for the content (range of payments) (col.2, 54-67).

Claim 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fucarile et al., U.S. patent 6,766,305 as applied to claim 53 above, and further in view of Day et al., 2001/0013011.

As per claim 56, Fucarile et al. discloses a business method as discussed above. Fucarile et al. does not disclose wherein the defined circumstances comprise at least one of promotional gifts to the user, rewards to the user for referrals, rewards to the user for multiple downloads of the content, rewards to the user for non-download transfers of the content, and rewards to the user for

Art Unit: 3621

purchasing a bundle of the content. Day et al. discloses wherein the defined circumstances comprise at least one of promotional gifts to the user, rewards to the user for referrals, rewards to the user for multiple downloads of the content, rewards to the user for non-download transfers of the content, and rewards to the user for purchasing a bundle of the content (p.6 & 36). It would have been obvious to modify Fucarile et al. to include wherein the defined circumstances comprise at least one of promotional gifts to the user, rewards to the user for referrals, rewards to the user for multiple downloads of the content, rewards to the user for non-download transfers of the content, and rewards to the user for purchasing a bundle of the content such as that taught by Day et al. in order to entice and encourage users to strengthen the user base by coming back multiple times.

Claims 55, 57 & 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fucarile et al., U.S. patent 6,766,305 as applied to claims 53 and 44 above, and further in view of Runje et al., U.S. patent application publication 2001/0032312.

As per claims 55, 57 & 58, Fucarile et al. discloses the business method as discussed above. Fucarile et al. does not disclose wherein the benefits comprise coupons for purchase of merchandise or wherein charging a license fee comprises receiving payment information from the user of the network enabled device or wherein the payment information comprises the user's credit card information. Runje et al. discloses wherein the benefits comprise coupons for purchase of merchandise (p221) or wherein charging a license fee

comprises receiving payment information from the user of the network enabled device (p221)or wherein the payment information comprises the user's credit card information (p221). It would have been obvious to modify Fucarile et al. to include wherein the benefits comprise coupons for purchase of merchandise or wherein charging a license fee comprises receiving payment information from the user of the network enabled device or wherein the payment information comprises the user's credit card information such as that taught by Runje et al. in order to enable the system to carryout the payments from the user by identifying the users through their credit cards and therefore decreasing the rate of fraudulent activity throughout the payment system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Behrang Badii whose telephone number is 571-272-6879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5771**.

Print & Schmark

Behrang Badii Patent Examiner Art Unit 3621

BB